

Magdalena Castillo of Joliet, Illinois, can better spend their hard-earned money back in Joliet, Illinois, than I and my colleagues can for them here in Washington.

I think we need to be celebrating the fact that we eliminated the marriage tax penalty, and we did it in two ways. For those who itemize their taxes, people like Jose and Magdalena Castillo, they are homeowners, so they itemize their taxes, we widen the 15 percent tax bracket so people like Jose and Magdalena Castillo can earn twice as much as a single person and stay in the 15 percent tax bracket, and that wipes out their marriage tax penalty.

And for those who do not own a home or give to their church or institution of faith or charity, so they do not have enough to itemize, they use something called the standard deduction, under our legislation, we double the standard deduction to twice that for singles, and for those who do not itemize, we eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

I thank the Republican majority and President Bush for eliminating the marriage tax penalty and helping bringing fairness to the Tax Code in 2003.

WORKING FAMILIES LEFT BEHIND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I listened to the comments of my Republican colleague who just spoke, and I have to say it is very difficult for me to celebrate the Republican tax bill because the fact of the matter is, so many working people have been left out and are not receiving any benefits from the Republican tax bill. It was interesting to listen to the previous speaker because he talked about if money was going back to working families, they could go out and spend it and that would help the economy. If that is the case, why were so many families left out of the child tax credit or left out of other benefits that were basically going, under this Republican tax bill, to the high-income people?

The spin on the other side of the aisle is amazing, but the editorial comments during the Memorial Day recess have basically shown this is essentially a fraud. The Republican tax bill does not do what it purports to do, and it leaves out so many working people. For those who might doubt what I say, I want to mention some of the editorial comments in the New York Times and Washington Post in the last couple of days.

In Monday's New York Times there was an opinion by Bob Herbert called "The Reverse Robin Hood," and I will go through certain sections that Mr. Herbert said. He said, "If you wanted a quintessential example of what the Bush administration and its legislative

cronies are about, it was right there on the front page of the Times last Thursday: 'Tax Law Omits \$400 Child Credit for Millions.'

"The fat cats will get their tax cuts. But in the new American plutocracy, there won't even be crumbs left over for the working folks at the bottom of the pyramid to scramble after.

"When House and Senate negotiators met last week to put the finishing touches to President Bush's tax bill, they coldly deleted a provision that would have allowed millions of low-income working families to benefit from the bill's increased child tax credit.

"It was a mean-spirited and wholly unnecessary act, a clear display of the current regime's outright hostility toward America's poor and working classes.

"The negotiators eliminated a provision in the Senate version of the tax bill that would have extended benefits from the child tax credit to families with incomes between \$10,500 and \$26,625. This is not a small group. According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, the families that would have benefited include about 12 million children, one of every six kids in the U.S. under the age of 17."

Mr. Speaker, how are you going to tell me that somehow this is putting money back in the pockets of working people?

□ 1100

These are working people. These people are not on welfare. They are out there working. They are getting nothing.

Then it goes on to say in the Herbert article:

And readers of yesterday's Times learned that another group of some 8 million mostly low-income taxpayers, and I say taxpayers, primarily single people without children, will also be left behind, getting no benefit at all from the President's tax cuts.

The comments just continue. This was yesterday's, Monday's, Washington Post. The editorial for the newspaper says, Children Left Behind. It says:

"Even for a debate over taxes, the public discussion taking place right now about child credits in the new tax law is particularly galling. Stiffing these children was not a last-minute oversight or the unfortunate result of an unreasonably tight \$350 billion ceiling. Adjustments had to be made," a spokeswoman for the House Ways and Means Committee said, as if those on her side would have preferred otherwise. In fact, the administration did not include this provision in its original, \$726 billion proposal. The House did not include it in its \$550 billion version. The Senate Finance Committee did not include it.

So when you try to get some suggestions from the Republicans that they are going to come down here and say, oh, this was an oversight or we are going to correct it, the President did not have this child tax credit for these

people in his original proposal, the Senate Republicans did not have it, the House Republicans did not have it. How can they come down here and suggest that somehow it is an oversight? They say they are going to correct it. I hope they do correct it, but that is going to take some time, and I question whether in fact they really will correct it.

The amazing thing to me is that we as Democrats have been saying all along how this Republican tax bill was not going to put money into the pockets of working families. Now all the editorial comments in every major newspaper say that that is true, the Daily News, you name it. Wherever it is around the country, they are all admitting the fact now that it is not true, that money is not going to those working people at the lower end of the spectrum. They are not getting the child tax credit. They are not getting anything. How can the Republicans now suggest that somehow that was an oversight or they are going to correct it in the future? The fundamental basis of their tax policy has been to give large amounts of money back to wealthy people, not to the average American. And the consequence of that is that the average American does not have money in his pocket, and there is no economic stimulus coming from this tax bill because it is not putting money back into the pockets of the average American in the way that they can go out and meaningfully spend it and actually have some stimulation for the economy. It is not happening.

THE NEW ERA OF BIOTECHNOLOGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SCHROCK). Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, next Thursday, June 12, the subcommittee I chair on research will hold a hearing on biotechnology, the potential and the safety. I am a farmer in Michigan, and this is the first year that I have used the so-called roundup ready soybeans to plant on my farm. I have held back, thinking that maybe the nongenetically modified soybean would bring a higher price or have expanded markets, especially in some of those areas of the world that are rejecting it.

However, that has not been the case. Biotechnology is now one of the most promising sectors of the economy. It is revolutionizing medicine with at least 95 biotech drugs already approved in the U.S., and there are another 371 drugs on the table for acceptance that are being developed for medications that could help cure cancer, heart disease, diabetes, and many other conditions. Biotechnology will produce higher-quality foods that can provide both nourishment and immunization to many of the billions of hungry people around the world.

In our NSF bill that was signed into law last December 22, we put language in that bill for grants to work with scientists from African countries to help develop the kind of products that could best help their particular country. Unfortunately, biotechnology has come under attack from some in the European Union and elsewhere who hope to avoid competition in this area. The Speaker of the House, USAID administrator, and leading scientists will testify at our congressional hearing June 12 on the safety and potential of plant biotechnology.

Back in the summer of 1999, the journal "Nature" published a study suggesting that pollen from genetically modified corn could harm the monarch butterfly population, really sort of sparking a worldwide controversy. While follow-up studies have since proven that such pollen presents no danger to monarchs, the foundations of fear based on emotion had been set, and soon other nonscience-based allegations about plant biotechnology emerged.

In response, my House Subcommittee on Research met with leading scientists across the country and followed with a series of hearings investigating the potential benefits and safety concerns associated with plant biotechnology. Our findings, compiled in a comprehensive report that we wrote that I entitled "Seeds of Opportunity," showed that crops developed through biotech were just as safe as those crops produced with traditional cross-breeding. Three years since we released the report, its findings still hold true and are now backed by an even larger body of scientific evidence. Also, America's three-pronged safety review by USDA, FDA, and EPA for biotech products comes as close to guaranteeing safety as you can get. I think that is why the Speaker of the House, DENNIS HASTERT, and several of us in Congress joined with Bush administration officials last month on May 12 to announce that the United States would file a WTO challenge to the European Union's import ban on genetically modified crops.

Enter Africa. President Bush rightly charged that the EU's ban is an unjust burden on the world's poorest countries. With approximately 180 million undernourished people and perennial low yields and quality brought about by droughts, insects and other disasters, Africa stands to benefit tremendously from GM crops. Yet here is the European Union exploiting Africa's dependency on the EU as a trading partner to stall acceptance of GM crops. Let me give Members an example. Starving Zambia rejected 23,000 tons of emergency U.S. food aid because Europe implied that it could respond by rejecting future corn exports from that particular country. There is even some evidence that EU pressure is impeding even research into new crop varieties that could feed Africa, that could cure a blight problem in bananas.

Our research subcommittee will be examining the barriers to plant biotechnology in Africa in more detail next week at the hearing and the Speaker of the House is going to be testifying about the challenge and about the safety as well as the administrator of AID and other scientists.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, sound science should drive what we do, not emotion.

Sound science, should drive trade and regulatory decisions associated with transgenic food crops, not protectionism masquerading behind a thin veil of unfounded fears. The U.S. challenge moves us one step closer to removing the unfair barriers that hurt American farmers and deny the people of Africa a wonderful tool for combating hunger.

REGARDING THE LATEST TAX CUT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the President's spokespeople, the Republicans in Congress and the Republican National Committee, appear to be having some trouble with the truth, that is, because they have suggested that everyone who pays taxes would benefit from the recent tax cut. They have said that those who pay the taxes will get the tax cut, that those who earn the least will benefit the most.

It is simply not true. It is simply not true, because they made a decision to leave millions of families, with millions of children, out of the child tax credit, a tax credit that we give families to raise children. But they simply decided that those families earning between \$10,000 and \$26,000 a year would not be eligible for the child tax credit. Somehow I guess these families have additional money to raise their children that people over \$26,000 a year do not have so they get to do this. They made a fundamental decision about unfairness, about inequity, about greed; and they decided that they would rather give this money to 200,000 millionaires so they could get a tax cut of \$93,000 a year because if they gave this tax cut to those families who are going to work every day trying to support their children on low wages, that they would have to give those millionaires only \$88,000 a year. So those families, those working American families between \$10,000 and \$26,000 a year, got nothing in terms of the increase in the child tax credit. The rest of the families in America will get a \$400 check this summer. These families will get nothing. Yet the President, the Republicans in Congress, in the House and the Senate, want to suggest that this was an accident and they are going to cure it.

It was no accident. It was never in their bill, in either version of their bill. They simply made the decision that

they did not think these people were worthy of the child tax credit, a tax credit that passed this Congress on a bipartisan basis because we thought the government ought to do something to help these families with the cost of raising their children; so that those moms who wanted to stay home, maybe this would allow them to stay home, or those fathers who wanted to stay home, maybe this would allow them to stay home; or it would defer the cost of child care or health care or whatever it takes as we raise our children in this country. But the Republicans have now decided for millions of American families, they are not going to be treated the same.

Of course we find out as we look at this tax bill for almost 50 million Americans, they will not be treated the same because they are not going to get much of a benefit. They just simply decided that they were going to declare class warfare on low-income working people in this country. There is no other result.

But now they want to lie about it. Now they want to pretend like they were not part of it. Now they want to pretend like they are going to fix it. No, the Bush-Cheney class in America just declared warfare on working families. But that is only the beginning, because it is the Bush-Cheney class in America that has denied those same families an increase in the minimum wage because many of these families work at the minimum wage. The minimum wage today is worth \$4.75 in real wages. They will not increase it. They will not give those families the child tax credit. This week later on the floor they are going to try to take away their overtime pay, and they are passing regulations so fewer and fewer Americans are eligible for overtime, a pay that many Americans use to hold their families together because that increase in pay for overtime makes a difference in their yearly salary in the support of their families. And, of course, for many of these same children who will not get the child tax credit, they are taking away their health care at the State level.

When is it that the Bush administration decided that they were going to declare war on America's working families, especially low-income working families? One of my colleagues was here talking about how they fixed the marriage penalty, that they got rid of the marriage penalty. Well, if two people who are earning 10 or \$12,000 a year get married, as single people, they would get a \$2,500 credit because they are both low-income working people. If they get married, they lose \$1,000 of their credit. They have almost a 50 percent tax assessed on them because they get married.

Why is this happening to these people who are struggling to get up and go to work every day? Every day they go to work in hard, difficult jobs, jobs that many Americans would prefer not to do. And at the end of the year they end